

REMARKS

I.

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 are presently active in the application. Claim 8 has been added by the present amendment. Claim 1 has been canceled.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of Claim 5.

Applicants also note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of their claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f) and receipt of all of the certified copies of the priority documents.

II.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not indicate what subject matter in Claim 7 is purportedly not adequately described in the specification. However, Applicants submit that Claim 7 as presently amended is clearly supported by an adequate written description.

III.

Support for the amendments to Claims 3, 6, and 7-8 can be found throughout the original specification, for example, on page 7, line 29-page 8, line 5 and page 9, lines 6-15; page 6, line 24-page 7, line 9; and page 12, line 35-page 13, line 2, respectively.

IV.

Claims 2-4 and 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubois (U.S. Patent No. 4,100,455) in view of Ogawa (U.S. Patent No. 4,803,399). This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to these claims as presently amended.

The vacuum fluorescent display device of Dubois comprises a cover 44 having a transparent portion at least in the line of sight 42 that is sealed to a substrate 12. The cover 44 and substrate 12 together form a hermetically sealed enclosure within which an anode 14 and a film 28, with associated parts, are contained. An electrostatic lens 38 is inside the cover 44 to avoid interference from a charge gradient which may be set up across the cover 44. The electrostatic lens 38 is a transparent conductive surface or foraminous screen placed in the line of sight 42 between the viewer and the illuminated segments of the anode 14 (see column 4, lines 9-21).

The display device of Dubois does not include the sealing section of the face plate and side plates on which a solid portion formed at the peripheral portion of a metal film is arranged. Nor does the electrostatic lens of the display device of Dubois include at least two regions, wherein opening portions and non-opening portions varying in a ratio in area are arranged. Furthermore, the electrostatic lens of Dubois is not made of aluminum. Ogawa fails to rectify the deficiencies of Dubois and instead merely teaches an aluminum reflector 3 having a curved surface disposed at the back of a liquid crystal display panel. Ogawa fails to teach or suggest the use of aluminum having a thickness of 1,000Å or more as a pseudo half mirror, as well as, a shield of electrostatic field and electrostatic disturbances in the vacuum fluorescent display device. It is only through the improper use of hindsight using applicants' disclosure as a template that a person having ordinary skill in the art would attempt to combine the teachings of the applied references in the manner proposed in the Office Action.

Accordingly, the applied references fail to teach or suggest a metal film for a pseudo half mirror arranged as and having the thickness set forth in claim 3. Therefore, claim 3 patentably distinguishes over the applied references.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 3. Thus, those claims patentably distinguish over the applied references for the reasons stated with respect to claim 3. Moreover, each of those claims includes additional limitations that further patentably distinguish over the applied references.

The applied references fail to teach or suggest a metal film for a pseudo half mirror having at least two regions wherein the metal film is partially varied in light transmittance by varying a ratio in area between the opening and non-opening portions in each of the regions as set forth in Claim 6. Accordingly, claim 6 patentably distinguishes over the applied references.

The applied references fail to teach or suggest a metal film for a pseudo half mirror arranged on a whole rear surface of the face plate including a display section of the fluorescent display device and a sealing section of the face plate and the side plates as set forth in Claim 7. According, Claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the applied references.

Claim 8 depends from Claim 7, and therefore, it patentably distinguishes over the applied references for the reasons stated with respect to Claim 7. Moreover, Claim 8 recites that the metal film includes a solid portion formed at a peripheral portion of the metal film corresponding to the sealing section of the face plate. That relationship is not taught or suggested by the applied references. Thus, Claim 8 further patentably distinguishes over the applied references.

Application No. 09/895,322  
Reply to Office Action of May 8, 2003

V.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable  
reconsideration and allowance of Claims 2-8.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)  
GJM:JRB/bu

James R. Boler  
Registration No. 37,058

I:\ATTY\JRB\210288US-AM.DOC